The Rush County Drainage Board met in the Commissioner's Room of the Courthouse on April 15, 2019 at 10 a.m. with the following present: Mark Bacon, Paul Wilkinson, Bruce W. Levi, members; Leigh Morning, Board Attorney; Marvin L. Rees, Surveyor; Shelle Hendrix, Secretary. Chuck Kemper and Warren Norris were also present.

A motion was made by Wilkinson with a  $2^{nd}$  by Levi to approve the minutes from the previous meeting. Motion carried and the minutes were approved and signed.

## **RUSHVILLE FLOODING**

Chuck Kemker reminded the Board a letter of intent is required before the end of April 2019 to apply for a grant.

## **RUSH COUNTY DRAINAGE POLICY**

The Surveyor showed photos of a property on which Mr. and Mrs. Houck plan to build a house. Wilkinson made a motion to approve the drainage plan with a 2<sup>nd</sup> by Levi. Motion carried and the plan was approved and signed.

The drainage plan for the Meyer property at 300 N and Rushville Rd was postponed until additional information can be obtained.

## WM GARNER OPEN

The Surveyor reported more work is being done to clean up after the flood. He will put together a watershed and stated the need to start assessments next year. A Hearing is required.

Wilkinson made a motion with a 2<sup>nd</sup> by Levi to recess until the Hearing at 11 a.m. Motion carried and the meeting was recessed.

## **CARR/STANLEY HEARING**

The meeting was called to order after the recess for the Hearing on the Carr/Stanley proposed reconstruction at 11 a.m.

A list of those in attendance can be found in the file in the Surveyor's office. The Surveyor read his report. The following landowners objected to the proposed reconstruction:

Susan and Richard Schaf question the use of the maintenance money they have been paying each year. They also question the amount of their proposed reconstruction assessment, and the amount the RR will be paying.

Steven Davis objects to the proposed reconstruction because he feels that it will do more damage than benefit to his property. He also asks the Board to consider putting the new drain past the west property line of his land and that the open ditch be cleaned from the point of the tile outlet to its junction with the Nelson Plummer Open drain. He further states that he would reconsider his objection if these changes were made to the proposed reconstruction.

Pat and Scott Tomlinson emailed me their concerns: Better communication i.e. regular update reports or more detailed minutes, online or PDF summary docs of the project. They also are concerned with the cost impact on all landowners. They ask the Board to explore other options i.e. assessments over a few years to build up funds earmarked for this project and a phased project approach allowing work to be completed in increments. They are also concerned with impacting farming practices.

Hugh and Sandra Schwartz sent a letter stating that they rejected the proposed reconstruction.

Veatch Family Limited Partnership I objected to the method of financing. They felt the 10% interest rate was excessive.

The total objections were 21.68% of the acres in the watershed.

Several landowners were in attendance and spoke about their concerns over the cost of the project.

Scott Pruitt had questions about the railroad and INDOT's financial responsibility. He also asked if the open ditch is included in the cost, to which Marvin Rees said that it is. Mr. Pruitt stated he currently stands opposed to the current proposal #1. He also had several questions about the proposed work open portion of the drain.

Jeff Ernstes spoke about a group of trees and asked if they should be removed and asked if there was an easier option.

Shawn Orme told about his conversations with other county surveyors and their experiences with working with the railroad and stated he doesn't think it's fair to assess landowners for the railroad's part of the expense.

Dustin Griggs said he thinks he's being assessed too much. Marvin Rees said he would check on it to make sure he's being fairly assessed.

Charlie Smith stated that we have been working on this for 5 years and feels like it is time to get the project done.

Board members examined maps the Surveyor provided and much discussion was held about the 4 possible options for reconstructing the arm and the tile. After lengthy discussion, Wilkinson made a motion to proceed with the project up to 300 N and do some research on obtaining refunds for the railroad's portion in the event they pay their part, with a  $2^{\text{nd}}$  by Levi. Motion carried.

•	usiness to come before the Board, Levi ma ed and the meeting was adjourned.	ide a motion to adjourn with a 2 <sup>nd</sup> by
Mark Bacon	Paul Wilkinson	Bruce W. Levi